### **Sediment TWG Feedback Form**

# for Draft Forest Roads Management Approach

1. Working definition of the universe of roads in consideration:

• Please list any road types that have not been included and that should be?

## **Forest Road Objectives:**

0

	0	
	0	
<u>2.</u>	Criteria for sediment delivery potential:	
•	Please provide any details or clarifications sug	ggested for the following sections in the Approach:
- (	Criteria for sediment delivery potential	Suggestions
	of Chronic Sediment Delivery	
	J <sup>QQ</sup>	
Episod	dic Delivery	
Comn	non Factors	
		<u>I</u>
<u>3.</u>	Ranking according to risk:	
•	Are additional details (or clarifications) neces	sary for the ranking guidelines? If so, please list
	below:	,
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	

• Do you have suggestions for prioritizing project areas in which to do road work?

#### 4. <u>Inventory/Information/Planning:</u>

• What type of information collection (methods, level of detail, means of processing/storage, etc.) is necessary to allow road system managers to quantify the number and type of water quality risks due to forest roads?



• Do you have suggested changes to the inventory and assessment metrics? (e.g. are there road situations that need to be included but are not listed or vice versa?)



,	
(	)

0

0

• Please list any information on identification protocols for road risks, either additional references or protocol suggestions?

0

0

	0		
	0		
•	Please list any sugge	sted changes for the Improvement and Removal Planning requirement.	
	0		
	0		
	0		
	0		
	0		
•		uggested elements for a Biennial Progress Report format (should convey t , avoid being burdensome, be adaptable to other road sectors).	hε
•			he
•	needed information		hε
•	needed information		hε
•	needed information	, avoid being burdensome, be adaptable to other road sectors).	he
•	needed information		he

• Timeline and Milestones:

Calendar Year	TMDL Year	Action Milestone	Suggestions
2013	0	TMDL Approved	
2015	2	Inventory & Assessment	
		Completed;	
		Start Road Work	
2017	4	Improvement &	
		Removal Plan Approved	
2019	6	-	
2021	8	25% of Plan Work	
		Completed	
2023	10	-	
2025	12	50% of Plan Work	
		Completed	
2027	14	-	
2029	16	75% of Plan Work	
		Completed	
2031	18	-	
2033	20	100% of Plan Work	
		Completed	

• Should the requirements for family forestlands (private nonindustrial) be based on ownership size or operational intensity/volume, and what threshold should differentiate between industrial and nonindustrial landowners?

• What (if any) types of monitoring are not included in the Monitoring/Evaluation section but should be?

0

0

0

0

• Do you have suggestions for or access to additional monitoring resources or suggestions for

	coordination of monitoring resources?
! <u>-</u>	5. Identify BMPs:
•	Please provide suggestions for references in addition to those cited in the document for use in choosing suites of BMPs for the various road situations that are a risk to water quality & beneficial uses?
	0
	$\circ$
	0
	$\circ$
•	Please list any experts and practitioners that you feel would provide valuable insight for the road situation/BMP table for this TMDL.
	•
	0
	0
	0
•	Do you have suggestions for guidelines for choosing among BMPs? For example, when should transportation restrictions be used? Minor upgrades? Major upgrades? Vacation (removal of road)?
	0
	0
	0
	0

#### General:

•	Do the 5 objectives address the information needs for forest roads? If not, what additional questions need to be asked?
•	Are there gaps in the Approach that have not been discussed in responses to the questions above and how can they be filled?
	of state of the st
•	How important do you feel it is to explore options for expanding the geographic scope to the entire Mid Coast basin?
•	Please provide any additional references for assessment of forest road risks to water quality or forest road BMPs?